
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

Meeting Date: 9/6/2016
Meeting Type: Regular Meeting
Staff Contact/Dept.: Amy Sowa
Staff Phone No: 541-726-3700
Estimated Time: Consent Calendar
Council Goals: Mandate

**SPRINGFIELD
CITY COUNCIL**

ITEM TITLE:COUNCIL MINUTES

ACTION**REQUESTED:** By motion, approval of the attached minutes.

ISSUE**STATEMENT:** The attached minutes are submitted for Council approval.

ATTACHMENTS:

Minutes:

- a. June 13, 2016 – Work Session
 - b. June 20, 2016 – Work Session
 - c. June 27, 2016 – Joint Elected Officials Work Session
 - d. July 18, 2016 – Work Session
 - e. July 18, 2016 – Regular Meeting
-

**DISCUSSION/
FINANCIAL
IMPACT:**None.

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY JUNE 13, 2016

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday June 13, 2016 at 5:33 p.m., with Mayor Lundberg presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Lundberg and Councilors VanGordon, Moore, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were City Manager Gino Grimaldi, Assistant City Manager Jeff Towery, Assistant City Attorney Kristina Kraaz, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Councilors Wylie and Ralston were absent (excused).

1. Downtown District Design Standards (File No. TYP414-00001).

Linda Pauly, Principal Planner, presented the staff report on this item.

Council directed staff to pursue concurrent amendments to the Springfield Development Code (SDC) and the Engineering Design Standards Manual (EDSPM) to implement Council's goals for Downtown's revitalization and to enable the new development and streetscape design envisioned in the Downtown District Urban Design Plan adopted by Council in 2010.

Downtown's revitalization and redevelopment continues to be a high priority of the Council and Springfield citizens. Increasing development capacity within the City center is a key element of the Springfield 2030 Comprehensive Plan. As the economy emerges from recession, the City can expect to receive more development proposals. Each could contribute to Downtown's improvement and the City's growth in potentially positive or negative ways, depending on the design of development and where development occurs. The proposed design standards are intended to enable new opportunities for larger scale, more intensive mixed-use commercial, employment and residential development, as well as opportunities for smaller scale infill on existing small lots. Instead of the City's existing Mixed Use Commercial zone "one size fits all" regulation, three different subareas are proposed to create design standards that are responsive to and respectful of the character and scale of Downtown's Main Street and the adjoining Washburne Historic District.

Since the Council's work session on Downtown Design (June 23, 2014) the City's Project Team (Linda Pauly, Kristi Krueger and Courtney Griesel) have been conducting a planning process to review and update the City's standards — working with the City's consultant, the Downtown Citizen Advisory Committee, and an interagency Technical Advisory Group. The Planning Commission discussed the draft standards on May 3rd. A Community Open House on May 4th was attended by 25 members of the public. At the May 23rd Council work session, consultant Marcy McInelly (UrbsWorks) presented an overview of the draft design concepts. Several more draft iterations will be produced between now and the end of the year to address and incorporate the input received. Updated design standards to address design elements will eventually be incorporated into the City's land use regulations as a new Downtown Plan District chapter of the SDC and a new chapter of EDSPM. The new code would include "form-based code" regulations to implement the new design standards for building form, setbacks, frontage, facades, height and other elements addressed in the attachments. At

this time, staff does not expect to incorporate significant changes to the list of permitted land uses currently allowed in the Downtown.

Ms. Pauly introduced Marcy McInelly, the consultant from UrbsWorks who presented at the last work session.

Mayor Lundberg discussed how they could best direct their questions to keep on topic. She checked with the rest of the Council.

Councilor Moore said she liked breaking it down into smaller pieces in design standards. She noted some questions she has regarding sidewalks.

Councilor Woodrow said she would like to scale it down to the subareas rather than the whole picture.

Mayor Lundberg said they would discuss the whole study, breaking it into segments. She asked staff to start with Streetscapes in each of the subareas. She asked Ms. Pauly to review the subareas.

Council reviewed the maps of the subareas.

Mayor Lundberg said in looking at the Streetscape Standards, she is fine with bulb-outs and parklets, but does not like bike corrals unless they are in low parking areas. Those riding bicycles can generally park farther away as they are more likely to be able to walk further. She doesn't want to take up prime parking spots. She likes the different color sidewalks in places where cars may be pulling out. In the width of sidewalks for the subareas, she didn't see where chairs and tables could go. It is also not clear where sidewalk widths would stay the same. The tree pits should be bigger to handle the roots. She suggested talking to Hanalei Rozen about how to make the tree well large enough to accommodate the trees to avoid tearing up the sidewalk. Having them large enough also helps with rain water runoff. It's also important to make the trees the right size so they don't block lights and signs. Leaves can get on roofs of buildings, clogging up the downspouts and HVAC systems, putting the onerous on the property owners to deal with those situations. She asked if three stories (90 feet) was the maximum in Subarea 1, and if that would include buildings next to the Washburne District.

Ms. McInelly said current zoning permits 90 feet. There are setbacks and stepbacks next to the Washburne District neighborhood.

Ms. Pauly said the City's existing standards in the code provide the reduced heights next to Washburne. They are trying to format this so it is easier to understand.

Mayor Lundberg said she likes the look of Downtown now, but the Mill Plaza subarea (D1) proposal allows a wider variety of materials. That concerns her and feels it would change the look of the Downtown core, and it would be the area up against the river. She also noted the proposal allowing neon signs in the Plaza area and asked Council to provide input. This subarea allows different materials which is a major shift. She noted the proposed requirement for 25 feet and 40% transparency. That is a lot of windows, which are much more expensive. She asked about the current standard.

Ms. McInelly said the transit center is an example of a building that has 25 feet windows. Many two story buildings Downtown are 25 feet or taller. The idea of these standards was to mimic the Downtown pattern. They looked at buildings that people liked and they are close to 60% transparency.

Mayor Lundberg said they need to decide what they want to see happen and where they want flexibility. Some storefronts Downtown are only one story and have shorter windows. Those would likely be the buildings a developer would tear down to rebuild. After talking with a builder/developer, the window standards would affect cost and would need to be penciled out. She liked the guiding principles of the structured parking with demarcation between the bottom and the top. She noted other buildings in Downtown with that distinction.

Councilor VanGordon asked if this document was going directly into the code, or just pieces of it.

Ms. Pauly said pieces of the design standards would go into the Development Code and streetscape standards would go into the Engineering Design Manual.

Councilor VanGordon said both documents were too complicated and he would like to see something more simplified. Both the presentation and context are too complicated. He would prefer to combine some of the zones, or something to make it easier for developers. He asked what width of sidewalk was currently allowed in Downtown.

Ms. McInelly said some are 5 feet and some 12 feet.

Councilor VanGordon asked about benches on the sidewalk as public space.

Ms. McInelly said café seating is applied for and is only for patrons of the establishment. A parklet could be more of a public space.

Councilor VanGordon said the language is confusing. When looking at streetscape furniture, it was noted they would be treated case by case by staff. He would like more clarity in that standard. He suggested removing the graphic showing a stand-alone bus lane since it is dependent on the outcome of the Main Street study. He doesn't want it to appear a decision has already been made. He agreed with the Mayor that the Mill Plaza should have more of a look of Downtown, but as a transition to Glenwood. He did not want skyscrapers.

Councilor Moore said the language describing alleys was interesting. It would be nice to indicate on the sidewalks where alleys are located for pedestrian safety. She asked how alleys provide connectivity.

Ms. Pauly said the alleys are currently heavily used.

Councilor Moore said she is concerned having alleys used for pedestrians. She asked if there is signage for safety. She asked how vegetative swales would work in Downtown.

Ms. Pauly said they do not currently have any swales. If large redevelopment occurs, the alley could be used as a swale.

Councilor Moore said she didn't envision benches looking out onto Main Street. She likes having the tree pits as large as possible to catch water, although the types of trees need to be considered. She is concerned about bike racks going on the sidewalk and is not sure how that is defined. She asked if there is a standard regarding how wide the sidewalk has to be for bike racks. She asked if bike racks are required for redevelopment.

Ms. Pauly said they are required for redevelopment.

Mayor Lundberg said it is a standard throughout the City.

Ms. McInelly said the location means whether or not it is located on the street and should be determined on a site by site basis. Placement tells where within the sidewalk zone bike racks can be located.

Mayor Lundberg discussed a process used when a business expanded and wanted to use the alley, and determination was made regarding who owned the alley. She asked staff to explain ownership of the alley.

Planning Manager Greg Mott said it may have been something the business had already paid for and as a condition of use been required to make improvements to the alley. When the alley is vacated, the City has a responsibility to recover costs the public has paid for.

Councilor Pishioneri located information on when this occurred in June 2003.

Mayor Lundberg asked if alleys were required.

Ms. Pauly said in some cases alleys are the only way to provide access for utilities. Every property will be different. She explained. Previous direction was to use the alleys.

Mayor Lundberg noted where alleys were depicted on South A.

Councilor Woodrow said she would like to see connectivity between the Plaza area, Downtown and eventually Glenwood. If they have an expanded idea of walkability and connectivity, she would like the character remain similar and enticing, and she's not sure a metal frame building would do that. This document is very complicated and difficult to understand. It is difficult to correlate the streets with the subareas. She feels they should have parameters for street furniture and if someone has something different, it could be addressed individually. She likes the colored sidewalks, but asked what type of maintenance would be needed for them. She likes the parklets, but is not in favor of bike corral. She would prefer they not take up space that could be utilized by people. She liked the demarcation and trim. She also agreed with the comments regarding trees and water recycling. Painting crosswalks and drains all lends to the character. She likes the alleys and the art alleys, and would like them utilized and enhanced. Springfield is becoming a go-to place for art.

Councilor Moore said when she thinks of the Mill Plaza, she thinks of a larger plaza where people sit and congregate. She asked if there was a vision or picture.

Ms. Pauly provided pictures of a plaza area. The vision is to have mixed use development with restaurants and retail on the ground floor. The plaza would be adjacent to the sidewalk. There would be pedestrian flow to Island Park.

Councilor Moore said adding that plaza into this plan is almost too big.

Ms. Pauly said it was brought into this project to provide principles to a developer who might choose to put in a plaza.

Councilor VanGordon said he would like a refresher work session on the Mill Plaza.

Mr. Grimaldi said staff could bring the standards back to Council and include additional time to discuss the Mill Plaza.

Councilor Pishioneri said he didn't like bike corrals using up vehicle spots, but prefers them off street. He likes the wayfinding sign recommendation. There should be a standard for the type of furniture allowed in parklets that is safe and sturdy. He likes the design and width of the benches and suggested putting armrests in the middle as well as on each end. He doesn't like to have his back to the street, but prefers to have his back against the wall. He is not clear where the bollards will be located. He likes the dark color metal galvanized for the furniture, but feels they should have the same design standard. He asked for explanation about Section 2.6 regarding façades and the wording to "commit contemporary treatment".

Ms. McInelly said the standards for the Downtown area are written to recreate much of the proportion of a traditional Main Street building. To contrast that, they are promoting a loosening up of standards outside that area for a more modern feel.

Councilor Pishioneri said he is concerned about keeping Downtown historic, and doesn't want to see something modern next to it.

Ms. McInelly said it would accentuate the Downtown pattern to make it more strong and special. In the Downtown areas, contemporary materials could be used as long as the proportion of the windows and wainscoting were carried through. She described how it could tie in such as the Royal Building.

Councilor Pishioneri said he doesn't want to depart from where they have gone.

Ms. McInelly said the theater is a contemporary building, but carries a lot of the traditional patterns.

Councilor Pishioneri spoke regarding street trees and noted that there are medium size trees that don't grow more than 30 feet. There is no specking for excessive runoff noted in the tree pits. Tigard has a minimum 1000 square feet for their tree pits. The tree size needs to be determined before setting a minimum tree pit.

Mayor Lundberg said it sounds like the Council would like the plaza to have a cohesive look to Downtown. She would like to remain open to the possibility of retail, etc. in the plaza area. Council needs to determine if they want to focus on this area for a plaza, or the square closer to City Hall as the plaza. They also need to determine how flexible they want to be with the plaza area in terms of redevelopment. Buildings and alleys are more complicated. She likes visuals and would like more pictures of examples of the different standards. When they get to the building standards, more in-depth conversations will be needed. She would like to have a group of builders look at the standards and provide feedback.

Mr. Grimaldi asked if there were any other issues regarding development standards.

Mayor Lundberg said they need more work sessions to discuss the development standards, with more visuals.

Discussion was held regarding development that may come in that changed original plans.

Mr. Grimaldi said a work session could be scheduled after the recess. He suggested that Council meet first before having an outside group review it.

Councilor Moore asked about the Booth Kelly plan.

Mr. Grimaldi said it was not a high priority at this time. Booth Kelly is currently fully leased with a waiting list so it is in good shape.

Mayor Lundberg said once the Mill Pond Paths are completed, Booth Kelly will take shape.

Mayor Lundberg noted that bulb outs should be painted so they are more visible for vehicles.

2. Recreational Marijuana Local Option Tax.

Bob Duey, Finance Director, and Kristina Kraaz, City Attorney, presented the staff report on this item.

ORS 475B.345 allows the City to adopt a 3% tax on marijuana items sold by retailers who are licensed by OLCC (under ORS475B.110). The tax must be adopted by ordinance that is referred by the City Council to the electors of the City at the next general statewide election, which occurs on November 8, 2016. If Council's decision is to proceed to the November election on this issue the appropriate timing would be to take such action and approve a final ballot time on July 18th prior to summer recess.

Mr. Duey described changes through the legislature regarding marijuana tax and State Shared Revenues. Beginning January of 2016, the formula will switch to how much is sold in each community. The Council could place a tax on the November 2016 ballot by adopting an ordinance to set the fee, and passing a resolution referring it to the voters. The State hasn't set rules on where funds from a local tax should go, so it is up to the Council to decide if they want that stipulated. It is difficult to estimate the amount will come into the City. He discussed anticipated amounts from State taxes. The tax is for recreational only.

Mr. Duey noted that the State could change the rules regarding what the funds from the tax could be used for. There are rumors the State could change the limit of 3% to something else in the future. This Council has been open regarding zoning and business licenses tax, and not banning sales, which is one of the criteria for placing the tax on the ballot.

Councilor Pishioneri said he is in favor of proceeding and would like to look at how to word a measure. He noted the tax on cigarettes which was more than what was being proposed by the State for recreational marijuana. He sees it as possible revenue for costs that will possibly be incurred by public safety. It could be a good source to offset the costs for the police levy.

Councilor Woodrow said she is also in favor and had similar thoughts regarding offsetting the police levy costs.

Councilor Moore asked about the cost of collection.

Mr. Duey said they could contract with the State, or could do it ourselves.

Councilor Moore said she would be interested in seeing a cost comparison for those two options. She likes the ideas of using the funds to help offset the police or fire levies.

Mr. Duey said he has not heard from the State about the cost of collection. The Council could move forward and determine later the costs of administration.

Ms. Kraaz said the State told the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) that the cost would be similar to what is taken off for similar items which is about 2%.

Councilor Moore said they could also put the funds towards the Library fund.

Councilor VanGordon said he is in favor and likes the idea of putting it back to public safety, and should possibly include that in the ballot title language. The details can be determined later.

Mr. Duey said once it is in the ballot title, the City would be locked in to that decision.

Councilor VanGordon said he feels the voters need to know where the funds are going.

Mayor Lundberg said she feels the voters will approve the measure. She asked about the breakdown of the State Shared Revenues.

Mr. Duey said State Shared Revenue goes into the General Funds. Public hearings are held each year asking the community where they want those funds, and no comments have been received.

Mayor Lundberg said they need to be careful how the ballot title is worded. When they passed the bond levy for public safety, people thought it was just for the jail and some people felt misled. She doesn't want to go out with anything that isn't absolutely clear. The money coming from the State will already be going to public safety. She doesn't want to get locked into something. She is concerned with the perception if it is designated for public safety, yet we still need to go out for bond measures.

Councilor Pishioneri said he wants to designate the funds. If it all went to public safety, it could free up General Funds for something else. He wants whatever wording is needed to maximize the ability for it to pass.

Mr. Grimaldi said the City conducted a recent survey about this tax and didn't include designating the funds to anything specific.

Ms. Kraaz said they could draft ballot title language with some options. Some jurisdictions put the funding option in the explanatory statement for the voter's pamphlet.

Mr. Duey said staff would come on back July 18 for discussion and action on the proposed ballot title.

Councilor Pishioneri asked that staff provide the summary as soon as it is available so councilors could give their individual input to Mr. Duey prior to the July 18 meeting.

3. Virginia-Daisy Bikeway Project Preliminary Design Concepts.

Emma Newman, Transportation Planner, and Michael Liebler presented the staff report on this item.

The Virginia-Daisy Bikeway project preliminary design concepts are in large part a result of the collaboration between staff and consultants at Alta Planning+Design. The project and design concepts are currently in the middle of the first round of outreach soliciting the community's feedback and preferences. Staff would like to combine the community input on the options and treatments proposed

in the Preliminary Design Concepts with the feedback and suggestions provided by the Planning Commission (6/7 work session) and City Council (6/13 work session) to help inform the next round of revisions which will lead to a final concept.

The Virginia-Daisy Bikeway Project is primarily funded through a grant by the ODOT Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee Transportation Enhancement Program. The project is located on Virginia Avenue and Daisy Street from 32nd to Bob Straub Parkway. A full description of the project background was included in the May 9 City Council Communication Packet.

One of the focuses of this project is to increase safety at 42nd and Daisy, and address multiple needs from the Springfield Transportation Plan (TSP) with one project. They are looking at contributing stormwater funds to help with traffic calming elements. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to share some of the initial feedback received from the community and Planning Commission. She presented a power point presentation.

The guiding principles of this project are:

- Find a safe and comfortable biking corridor that can be used by bicyclists of all ages and abilities.
- The design of the bikeway should enhance the overall appeal for all users and groups, pedestrian safety and usage, provide traffic calming for automobiles
- Enhance the neighborhood feel. Since Daisy was opened for connectivity, there have been no steps taken to mitigate speed.

Community Outreach for this project has included open houses, postcards to neighbors, being present at the Willamalane Safety Fair, site visits by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), in-person meetings by staff with property owners, and received and responded to 24 phone calls.

Ms. Newman said they are trying to provide a consistent feel and treatments that are appropriate for traffic volumes, such as mini-roundabouts, medians and raised crossings. She displayed photos showing what the treatments could look like along this corridor and explained how they work. Different options were highlighted for Council consideration.

Ms. Newman noted that a parking utilization study was conducted, taking counts at different times throughout the day, as well as weekends. The treatments being proposed are appropriate based on the results of that study. She explained those treatments.

During their outreach, they found the property owners near the intersections were amenable to the project for safety purposes.

Ms. Newman noted that the Planning Commission prefers a roundabout at the 42nd Street intersection, as opposed to the 32nd Street intersection. They feel the shared bike lanes are appropriate as proposed, and agree that consistent signage is important.

Councilor Woodrow likes the 32nd Street crossing and the 42nd roundabout. She is not in favor of mini roundabouts, trees and the stormwater treatments. The stormwater treatments in Eugene are very confusing and less safe. If there is a way to accomplish that without distracting from the people on the street, it could make sense. She didn't like the pedestrian signal because it wasn't consistent. She is very concerned about safety.

A photo of a mini roundabout was displayed.

Mr. Liebler said they had heard concerns about landscaping and visibility of roundabouts. The mini-roundabout includes striping a low-profile center island. The photo helped to alleviate the citizen's concerns.

Councilor Woodrow asked who has the right-of-way.

Mr. Liebler said it works in the same way as a normal roundabout. If someone has a large vehicle or trailer, there is the ability to drive up and over the center island somewhat.

Councilor Woodrow said she could consider that, but still felt strongly about the other treatments.

Councilor Moore asked if \$700,000 covered all of the costs.

Ms. Newman said they have not received a cost estimate on this project yet, but are still looking at the concepts. They would get that information and bring it back to the Council.

Councilor Moore said it looks like additional right-of-way would need to be acquired for the roundabout on 42nd Street. She asked if they were cutting into properties extensively.

Ms. Newman said this is still a concept, but staff has talked with the property owners. One property owner would like to have their property taken, as does the person on the other corner as it would provide more access for her and visibility. The properties on the northeast and northwest corners may have some issues that could be addressed and provide safety improvements.

Councilor Moore said she likes the roundabouts. The stormwater treatment depicted on Attachment 2, page 6 should not affect traffic due to the location. Those kinds of things don't upset her driving, and provide separation between sidewalks.

Councilor Pishioneri asked the colors on the options.

Ms. Newman said most are to delineate parking and driving lanes.

Councilor Pishioneri said he is uncomfortable with a lot of the proposal.

Ms. Newman said the cost included \$710,000 for the bikeway project, and \$500,000 for the overlay.

Mr. Liebler said the overlay project is planned regardless of the bikeway.

Councilor Pishioneri said the vast majority of comments included concerns about loss of parking. He asked how many people felt comfortable with the project.

Ms. Newman said people came to staff first with concerns about parking. Once staff talked to people about their specific location and how parking would be accommodated, they were more comfortable.

Mr. Liebler said once they had the conversation, the majority were fine with the project.

Councilor Pishioneri said the study should have included a dinner time check on the weekend when most people are home.

Mr. Liebler said they could do a check during that time.

Councilor Pishioneri asked why they weren't proposing the beacons that are on Main Street for this project.

Ms. Newman said the pedestrian hybrid beacon is an option and would be for people crossing South 42nd to activate. The neighbors wanted to have treatments that worked for all users.

Mr. Liebler said all of the signalized options would require advanced signalization with warning lights. The roundabout option physically constrains and slows down traffic, and accommodates left turns westbound on Daisy.

Councilor Pishioneri said he can't support the large green island sanctuary. He feels a lot of this is overkill. He would like to see safe movement, but doesn't want to see city streets converted to bicycle streets because those driving on the streets are paying for the streets. He is fine with the calming effects, but not trees in the street as it takes away parking. He asked if they talked with the owner or renter on the northwest property at 42nd and Daisy.

Ms. Newman said they talked with the resident, and mailed the property owner. They have not had a conversation with the property owner yet.

Councilor VanGordon said the intersection at South 32nd looks good. He would prefer the roundabout on the South 42nd Street intersection as it would promote safety and improve traffic flow. The other alternatives seem to be overkill. The red parking is interesting, but he's not sure it is necessary for safety. He would like to hear more about it. He is surprised at the amount of traffic on this corridor. Regarding the mini-roundabouts, he could be supportive if it is more of a friction than something with landscaping. He has concerns about the trees and noted a lot of comments from the public. He asked if people were less concerned once hearing more details about the trees.

Mr. Liebler said some people didn't want trees and some did. The main concern was regarding their responsibility in maintaining the trees. Staff would work with the individuals if that was an option. It was about 50/50 in favor of trees for beautification.

Councilor VanGordon said perhaps they should describe it as being for beautification. He agreed it is best to look at them on a case by case basis. If all of the funding came in, they may be able to do everything. If not, the most important thing is getting the intersection treatments done.

Councilor Moore said the purpose of the project is to provide an east/west alternative for bikers to avoid Main Street. The funding is from the State. She has gotten a positive response from many commuters who ride their bikes to work about having an alternative. She thanked staff for reaching out to the neighbors.

Mayor Lundberg agreed that the purpose was to find an alternative to get people off Main Street. She noted the current connectivity in Springfield for bicyclists. Bikers look for the straightest route and the purpose of the Virginia-Daisy connector is to get people off Main Street for bikers, but also to accommodate vehicles. People have wanted to bicycle and this recognizes that and offers a safe alternative. The colored parking does stand out very well and is clear. It looked like there was more support for mini roundabouts and raised crosswalks than objections. There were more objections for trees, but some may want them so working with each property owner is a good idea. The proposal accomplishes what she hoped.

Councilor VanGordon said it would be helpful to simplify the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) to make it more understandable for citizens.

Councilor Woodrow said an occasional tree is fine, but they can also impeded bicycles as well. She would be voting against a major amount of trees or stormwater treatments.

Mr. Grimaldi said staff would bring this back to Council in September for a final look.

Mayor Lundberg said she didn't want September to be the last time they review since there were a couple of councilors absent from tonight's meeting.

Councilor Moore said it would be presented to the BPAC tomorrow. It will be good to hear their feedback.

Mr. Grimaldi said they would bring it back for one more work session, then a regular meeting for a decision.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Christine L. Lundberg
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY JUNE 20, 2016

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday June 20, 2016 at 6:00 p.m., with Mayor Lundberg presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Lundberg and Councilors VanGordon, Wylie, Moore, Ralston, and Woodrow. Also present were City Manager Gino Grimaldi, Assistant City Manager Jeff Towery, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Councilor Pishioneri was absent (excused).

1. Street Repair Ballot Measure.

Anette Spickard, Development and Public Works Director, and Jeff Paschall, City Engineer, presented the staff report on this item.

At Council's January 25, 2016 work session, staff presented the results of the City's 2015 pavement condition report along with the list of unfunded High Priority Street Preservation and Repair projects. Council discussed several options for financing these projects and directed staff to conduct a scientific survey of registered voters to gauge the community's interest in improving street quality and their opinion of a fuel tax and/or general obligation bond (property tax) to fund needed repairs.

While the City no longer has a pavement preservation program due to cutbacks that occurred in 2007, the City has been successful in leveraging federal and state dollars to maintain our most critical arterial and collector streets. Even with these investments 42% of arterials and more than 50% of the collectors and local streets are now rated in poor condition. The estimated cost of the repair backlog is \$30 million. Staff will present example project lists of what could be completed in a five year period if a new revenue stream is approved by voters.

If Council would like to ask voters for approval of a tax measure to fund street repairs, Council can give direction to staff at this work session to prepare language for a Ballot Title, Measure, and Summary for the November 2016 election and bring those back to Council for a vote at the July 18, 2016 regular session. If Council wishes to continue the discussion, another work session is scheduled for July 11, 2016.

The survey was conducted in late May 2016 and results received by the City in early June. The executive summary of the survey results were provided for Council review. In short, the survey revealed that voters are aware of the poor condition of the street system, addressing the backlog is a priority and there is support for a modest tax increase to keep the situation from becoming insurmountable. Results show support for a 2 cent fuel tax increase and potential support for a 3 cent fuel tax increase. Respondents preferred a fuel tax because it is directly related to usage and is seen as more fair than a property tax. There is little support for a general obligation bond (property tax) measure at this time.

Ms. Spickard reviewed the survey results. The high level survey findings show that:

- 64% agreed our streets are in serious disrepair; however 63% are not aware of the City's efforts to address the backlog.
- 62% support a modest tax increase to repair Springfield's streets.
- When given a choice of tax methods to pay for street repairs, 52% prefer a fuel tax increase, 27% prefer a general obligation bond, and 19% do not want a tax increase of any amount.
- There is 62% likely support for a 2 cent fuel tax increase.
- There is 55% likely support for a 3 cent fuel tax increase.
- 52% said that the Council does not need a sunset clause on the fuel tax in order to have their support.
- 55% said the Council's endorsement of a measure has the highest impact on their decision whether to support a measure.
- 50% agreed that the elected officials in Springfield are completely trustworthy.

Based on the results of the survey, the consultant would recommend the Council put a 2 or 3 cent fuel tax on the ballot, with outreach and education about the condition of the streets. Staff developed a project list of what could be done with a 2 cent tax or a 3 cent tax. She noted that each additional penny of fuel tax is estimated to generate about \$370,000. The City's backlog is close to \$30M. A fuel tax increase would be a start towards making progress.

Councilor Ralston asked how much of an increase in the fuel tax would it take to catch up on our backlog.

Ms. Spickard said it would take about 7 cents increase to cover the entire backlog.

Mr. Grimaldi said the state is also considering some funding.

Councilor Ralston said he was fine with the 2 cent or 3 cent tax.

Councilor Wylie asked what City of Eugene has for a fuel tax at this time.

Ms. Spickard said they currently had 5 cents.

Councilor Wylie said she is good with a 2 or 3 cent gas tax, but feels we need to advertise the comparison with Eugene. She would also like to look at other options such as having the marijuana tax go to street repair.

Councilor Woodrow said she was fine with either a 2 or 3 cent tax. She feels they could get the 3 cent increase with the margin of error in the survey.

Councilor VanGordon asked about turning the gas tax into a revenue bond.

Ms. Spickard said in consulting with the Finance Department, they determined they would need to use about 5 cents minimum to back a revenue bond. It would then tie up those funds needed for projects.

Councilor VanGordon said he likes the idea of putting out a project list or map of projects that could be accomplished with the tax. He could support either 2 or 3 cents, but would prefer 3 cents. The survey data is not that different. He wants to be cautious about presenting information to the voters that this will not get us all the way. We need a state transportation bill.

Councilor Moore agrees 3 cents is good. She would be concerned that the body of the ballot measure includes information that this will only begin the work, and would not take care of everything. She asked about street map for projects that could be done with 3 cents.

Mr. Paschall said the 3 cents shows a first year project list that includes overlay preservation on 42nd Street, as well as the residential slurry seal program. He further explained the lines on the map and when projects could be done. The extra cent could get us caught up on residential slurry seal.

Councilor Moore asked if they had a plan of how this would be put out to the citizens.

Mr. Paschall said he took the project list from earlier this year that shows the high priority needs, and determined which projects could be completed with either 2 cents or 3 cents. Although this doesn't address the backlog, it should help keep the backlog from getting worse.

Mr. Grimaldi said there is a 5 percent margin of error in the survey. He noted the difference between the 2 cent and 3 cent results. The Mayor has a lot of experience in polling trends.

Councilor VanGordon asked if we would be able to remain caught up once we are caught up with the backlog.

Mr. Paschall said we would need \$4.5 to \$5M annually to have a full-fledged residential slurry seal program, and keep up on our thin lift overlays, crack sealing, potholes, etc.

Councilor Woodrow said any time people have had a slurry seal on their street, they have been happy. That could be a good selling point.

Councilor Moore asked about the City's current shortfall.

Ms. Spickard said we have no funds for preservation.

Mr. Paschall said the revenue the City has been able to designate on the capital side has been used to leverage federal dollars for projects such as Gateway, Thurston Road, etc. Those grants go in cycles and always require a match.

Ms. Spickard said state funding is for operations, engineering, maintenance, and daily operations. Any funds left at the end of the fiscal year have been set aside for funding opportunities.

Councilor Moore said the City should let the public know when grants are awarded and for what projects.

Mayor Lundberg said part of the concern is that people may feel we are going out for either this tax or the marijuana tax. It needs to be very clear and differentiated there are two measures. She said she spoke with Councilor Pishioneri and he supports a 3 cent tax. She said they need to have a group to form a yes committee. Mayor Lundberg said she is willing to help, but it will take all of the Council. An information campaign needs to get the word out and it will take some funding. Work has to be done. The councilors need to make those calls.

Mr. Grimaldi said the consultant stressed that they would only get the positive results with an organized campaign.

Mayor Lundberg said it was up to the elected officials to campaign for the measure.

Ms. Spickard said she would work with the City Attorney's office to draft a ballot title for consideration during the July 18 Council meeting. It is difficult to determine what the funds would be used for since the project list changes and the tax would be ongoing. They can include the current situation and project list in the informational materials.

Councilor Ralston said he agreed with 3 cents and would work on a campaign. This is an important issue.

Mayor Lundberg confirmed the full Council agrees with 3 cents.

2. 2016 Council Priority Initiatives Update.

Jeff Towery, Assistant City Manager, presented the staff report on this item.

As the City of Springfield moves into FY17, Council may benefit from an update of current initiatives, setting the stage for leadership to effectively allocate resources and staff hours to the highest priority projects:

- Consolidated Accounts Receivable – Finance Dept.
- Priority Based Budgeting Analysis – Finance Dept.
- DUII Court Program – Springfield Municipal Courts
- New Art to Attract Visitors – City Manager's Office
- Downtown Façade and Business Space Readiness Investments – City Manager's Office
- Prepare Glenwood for Future Development – City Manager's Office
- Advanced Timber Products/Cross Laminated Timber – City Manager's Office
- Springfield Economic Look – Regional Competitiveness and Industry Assessment and Economic Strategy – City Manager's Office
- Industrial Site Opportunity Look – City Manager's Office
- Booth Kelly Redevelopment Strategy – City Manager's Office
- Fire Local Option Levy Renewal – Fire Dept.
- Police Operating Levy Renewal in 2017 – Police Department
- Main Street Traffic Safety Improvements – Development and Public Works
- Age-Friendly Community – City Manager's Office
- Workforce Diversity, Inclusion & Competency – Human Resources
- Work with community to develop financing strategy for street system preservation and maintenance – Development and Public Works
- City-wide bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and way-finding implementation plan – Development and Public Works
- New Library Facility – Library
- Code Enforcement – Police Department

Any Council feedback will be incorporated into future project updates, work sessions and action items.

Last April, Council was presented with a list of priority initiatives. Council asked to have all of those initiatives brought forward. In October staff brought additional initiatives related to economic development and Council asked to have those move forward as well. Over the course of the last year,

some of the projects have come back to the Council as updates. Many of the economic development initiatives did not have staff when first brought forward. Those initiatives were brought to the Budget Committee and staff and resources were identified.

Councilor Woodrow said she read through it and she liked what was done and how it was put together. It outlined where we were and where we are now. She appreciated the timeline.

Councilor VanGordon asked about the initiative related to the redevelopment of Booth Kelly. He asked if we are able to put money aside to invest in redevelopment in the future.

Mr. Towery said staff is in the process of doing a capital assessment of Booth Kelly and what repairs need done. Money is set aside for some of those repairs. They wanted to do that first before doing the redevelopment plan.

Councilor VanGordon referred to the DUII program and said he felt it was written in relation to causation and not correlation. As that program develops, he would like to look for other potential things may be driving down the numbers. Other than that, it looks great.

Councilor Moore asked about adding a citizen review component to the Priority Based Budget (PBB) process. She asked if that was a separate committee.

Mr. Towery said there is a lot of flexibility in how that gets done. We have examples of how other communities have done it.

Mr. Duey said when setting goals, we want to check with the community to make sure it is what they want. Council was not interested in forming that committee last year, but it has remained on the list as something to consider in the future. They could check with the community through a survey or something similar.

Councilor Moore said she was thinking of a committee such as the Budget Committee. She asked how much surveys cost.

Mr. Grimaldi said normally between about \$24,000 to \$26,000.

Councilor Moore said she was not sure she would like to have that type of survey, but perhaps asking people during community events.

Mr. Duey said there are a number of ways to approach this. He explained.

Councilor Moore said she would like to receive more citizen input. She asked if the art projects were all funded through transient room tax (TRT) dollars.

Mr. Towery said the primary source of funds for the art project is from TRT, but they have also leveraged grants and some outside sources. Fox TV underwrote the costs for the Simpson Mural.

Mr. Laudati said the Military Memorial would use some TRT funds as well.

Councilor Moore said she would like to get that out to the citizens so they are aware of the funds being used. She appreciated the track changes on the document to see what has been changed, and how to move forward.

Mayor Lundberg referred to the initiative about the fire levy being affected by higher ambulance call volume. She had asked Chief Groves about call volume, and scheduling a meeting to discuss this with Eugene and Lane County. It is now being referred to as Mayor Lundberg's Task Force on Call Volumes. The meeting is scheduled and she wanted to let the Council know. High call volumes are affected when people use the 911 system when it's not needed. She also referred to Main Street Traffic Safety Improvements. She likes the Safe Routes to School Program and the Point-to-Point Solutions, but she is not sure if they are always cost effective. She would like to look at those to see if they are cost effective. She also wants to teach bicyclists the rules of the road. If they are spending money on safety, they need to start promoting education to kids and adults. A Safety Corridor was discussed at one point. She thought Council was interested in a Safety Corridor Designation on Main Street if the speed limit is lowered.

Mr. Grimaldi said he didn't believe that was currently on the list for Main Street, but it could be added.

Staff will do follow-up and send information in a Communication Packet.

Mayor Lundberg said it is something to consider. Enforcement is really what is needed and wanted from the businesses. She would love to have code enforcement in our UGB. Council agreed it was something to look into further. She would like to see figures for funds spent and support for special events.

Mr. Grimaldi said staff could provide more information.

Mayor Lundberg said she wants to see it as part of a work program similar to art projects.

Mr. Towery said these initiatives were to focus on implementing Council goals. Some events have been done for many years and were not included. Staff could report back to Council.

Mayor Lundberg said including it in the annual report would be fine. She asked when the PBB updates would come to Council.

Mr. Grimaldi said they were not quite to that point. They are using PBB to do things internally. The City is not growing and PBB is often used to see where we want to grow, or where contracting might be used for certain services they want to eliminate.

Mayor Lundberg said the Council should look at the PBB before it goes out for citizen comment.

Councilor VanGordon said he would like to see a list of example activities that staff has taken action on internally through PBB.

Councilor Wylie said one of the biggest flaws in PBB is that it often prioritizes unpopular things that are very important near the bottom of the list. They need to balance that.

Mr. Grimaldi said the best opportunity to come back to the Council with PBB is early in the budget process next year. Currently, the major activity under PBB includes the new budget system implemented by the Finance Department which will have more of a program budget which will dovetail with PBB. Staff can provide a clearer picture when they bring it back next Spring.

Councilor Moore referred to the initiative for the Library and preparing an RFP for Library Needs Assessment and Programmatic Facility Design. She asked if that had been done.

Ms. Griesel said it has just been posted.

Councilor Moore asked if they had any idea of the cost.

Mr. Towery said they built the RFP around the funds available.

Councilor Moore asked how they make the decision whether or not to renew the Police Levy in 2017. They won't be able to eliminate both the Fire and Policy levies. She asked when they would receive information.

Mr. Towery said typically the Council would see information in late winter or early spring of 2017 to look at the November ballot. It will be around the discussion of the budget. During the previous legislative session, there was the possibility of a legislative fix to allow jurisdictions to roll ongoing tax levies into their tax base, but that did not move forward.

Mr. Towery said as long as this format worked for the Council, staff would continue to update this and bring it back each year.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Christine L. Lundberg
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE JOINT ELECTED OFFICIALS
WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL
LANE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
LANE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MONDAY JUNE 27, 2016

The City of Springfield Council met in a joint work session with the Lane County Board of Commissioners and Lane County Board of Commissioners in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday June 27, 2016 at 5:32 p.m., with Mayor Lundberg presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present from the City of Springfield were Mayor Lundberg and Councilors VanGordon, Wylie, Moore, Ralston, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were City Manager Gino Grimaldi, Assistant City Manager Jeff Towery, Principal Planner Linda Pauly, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith, Assistant City Attorney Kristina Schmunk, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Present from the Lane County Board of Commissioners were Board Chair Stewart and Board Members Sid Leiken, Pete Sorenson, and Jay Bozievich. Also present were County Administrator Steve Mokrohisky and Senior Planner Keir Miller. Commissioner Farr was absent.

Present from the Lane County Planning Commission were Commission Chair Charlie Conrad, and Commissioners Gary Rose, Randy Hledik, Ryan Sisson, Dwight Coon, Charlcie Kaylor, Jason Theisfeld, and Larry Thorp.

Mayor Lundberg welcomed everyone and thanked them all for making the trip to Springfield for this important discussion. She said this joint meeting with the Lane County Planning Commission and Lane County Board of Commissioners was to allow them all to hear the information at the same time.

1. Springfield 2030 Plan Update: Economic Opportunities Analysis Final Report and Proposed Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) Amendment to Add Land to the UGB Designated for Employment; Natural Resources; Public Facilities; Parks and Open Space. (Metro Plan Amendment File No. LRP2009-00014).

Linda Pauly, Principal Planner, presented the staff report on this item.

Ms. Pauly introduced Keir Miller from Lane County.

Ms. Pauly said Springfield is doing the employment land determination. Residential land designation was done in 2011 when the Springfield urban growth boundary (UGB) was adopted. This is about planning for the future and the jobs for future generations. Hearings were held on Springfield's Commercial and Industrial Lands Buildable Lands Inventory and Economic Opportunities Analysis (CIBL/EOA) in 2010, and the final report is now complete. This is part of what the two jurisdictions will be asked to adopt in September.

Ms. Pauly said the analysis was dictated by State law and Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) and included an inventory of how much land we have available, an economic opportunities analysis of

what types of jobs we will need in the future, what types of industries are needed to grow our economy, and what industries are a good fit with our community. Staff looked to see if the City had the right type, size and location of sites that would work with those types of industries. During the CIBL process, the committee identified a number of target industries for the community, and the size of site needed. They found the City does not currently have the size of sites for those industries. State law provides that the City can identify certain site characteristics for employment that will dictate where the UGB will expand. During that process, staff went back and revised the analysis to provide more detail about industries and site needs. Staff then went out and looked at how much land is already designated for the appropriate zoning within the City limits, and then determined if we had enough of that land to meet the needs. She referred to the final analysis that identified where those needs could be met. It was estimated that 10% of needed jobs would be filled through existing space, about 14% with home-based businesses, 23% through the UGB expansion, and 31% through vacant land inside the UGB. The city has enough sites that are 5 acres or less, but we need sites larger than 5 acres. The target number of suitable acres they are looking to add to the UGB is 223. "Suitable acres" means not constrained by wetlands, riparian area setbacks, slopes 15% or greater, or floodway. She noted that floodplain is considered suitable for purposes of our inventory and analysis. State Planning Goal 14 outlines how cities need to grow. Before expanding, the City needs to show our needs cannot be accommodated by land already in the UGB.

Ms. Pauly said the Council had asked for some examples of what development would look like in several different areas. She displayed a map showing existing employment areas and proposed areas.

Councilor Ralston asked why Highway 126 was not outlined as a major transportation corridor.

Ms. Pauly said they were only look at parcels of land that were developable for the inventory. She referred to a map of the proposed UGB expansion which would add 257 acres of suitable employment land, a bit more than the 223 which was identified as the land need. This additional land is to accommodate public facilities to serve the areas. They are looking to add 455 acres of public land, parks and open space. Some areas are already publicly owned park land, and include SUB wellfields. Willamalane requested those lands be brought in to the UGB as it is more efficient to manage current park lands if they are brought into the UGB. Currently, those properties are outside the Metro Plan so are subject to three plans.

Ms. Pauly reviewed the UGB Alternatives Analysis. The City is using ORS 197.298 to establish priority of lands to study when expanding the UGB. The first priority under the law for expansion is urban reserves, the second priority is exception areas, and the third priority is marginal lands. The staff report goes through every parcel and explains why each is not suitable. Springfield's 2nd and 3rd priority lands are quite distant from our current UGB. Many cities have exception areas close to their UGB. The fourth priority is resource land. Once they reach resources land, they must go through criteria to evaluate every potential site. Each area has been explained in detail in the staff report. Staff looked at soil capability classification and prioritized land based on capability class which is established by the Natural Resource Conservation Service. Some Class 2 areas are in the proposed expansion area as most of Springfield's surrounding land has some Class 2 soil. She noted the north Gateway area and how it was broken up. She discussed all of the areas considered and how those were analyzed and evaluated.

Ms. Pauly noted that expansion would add large sites in north Gateway and near the Mill Race site. She referred to maps of each area. Several members of the Board had asked that land between the current UGB to the river be included so it is not in County control, so that has been done. Having I-5 visibility is important for the industrial lands. She also noted that the proposal does not include land

west of I-5. She referred to the North Gateway area and the land that is in the floodway which is being proposed for natural resource. She also noted the industrial sites.

Commissioner Stewart asked about new proposed Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) report and possible impacts.

Ms. Pauly said staff has done what they can to address that report.

It was decided that could be discussed in further detail after her presentation.

Ms. Pauly said the proposed zoning for this area is new and is called the Agriculture Urban Holding Area. This allows the City to bring it into the UGB, do additional planning work, allow existing uses, and hold it for future urbanization to meet the employment land needs. In the Mill Race site, SUB had purchased some property from Knife River for wellfields. She noted where industrial and public land is located in this area, as well as urban holding and public space.

Ms. Pauly referred to a final UGB map with proposed expansions. The Lane County Board will have a first reading on the ordinance on July 26. She reviewed the elements of the adopting ordinance. Our area is in transition with comprehensive planning because of HB3337. Springfield and Eugene are both developing comprehensive plans separately from one another, but coordinated. The two cities will still be planning public facilities and regional transportation facilities, and would still be coordinating planning efforts. The City will also be establishing the zoning code to address the new zone, as well as the zoning map. They will also be looking at the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan. Open houses are scheduled for August 3 and September 8, with further outreach occurring prior to and between those dates. A joint public hearing is scheduled for September 12, 2016.

Mr. Miller said this is a City initiated proposal, although Lane County would be required to co-adopt some plans to enable it to be initiated. The County reviews UGB expansion processes frequently, and he commends Springfield's staff. This is one of the most thorough and complete packets he had seen with comprehensive analysis. He feels confident about the proposed expansion areas and analysis. The City of Springfield is proposing to expand their UGB, which would then go into areas currently governed by the Rural Comprehensive Plan. The County would be required to implement a Rural Comprehensive Zoning Plan change. He noted a link to this document. Lane County also co-adopts the City of Springfield Code within the UGB and with the amendments to the Springfield zoning code, Lane County would need to co-adopt those changes. The Rural Comp Plan Maps will also be amended. In 2010, there was a recommendation by the Lane County Planning Commission following a public hearing to forward an affirmative recommendation on the Metro Plan Economic and Urbanization components of this proposal. A lot of this work had already been vetted by the Planning Commission.

LC Planning Commissioner Conrad asked about a small tip of land on the map showing the wellfield that was not proposed to be inside the UGB.

Ms. Pauly said there are places where staff had to make a decision about extending the UGB to a parcel line, river channel lines, etc.

City Surveyor Chris Moorhead said that is one section that is a remnant of an old channel of the river. There is a portion at south tip that is part of the tax lot to the south. Staff had decided to go with tax lot boundaries.

Ms. Pauly said part of the ordinance provides an explanation for each split tax lot.

LC Planning Commissioner Hledik asked if the urban holding designation was a Springfield innovation or modeled after another jurisdiction.

Ms. Pauly said it was something other cities such as the City of Redmond had used. The way we are doing it is different.

LC Planning Commissioner Hledik asked if it was essentially an urban reserve area.

Ms. Pauly said it is somewhat different and not to be confused with urban reserves under State law. These are lands they assume can be served in the planning period.

Mr. Miller said urban reserves are land outside the UGB held for future urban needs.

LC Planning Commissioner Hledik said he knows there are State criteria for expanding into urban reserves. He asked if there would be additional requirements with this land in the UGB.

Ms. Pauly said these would be in the UGB and could be easy to annex. If someone would like to develop, there is a path for them to take through the City's process. That process is spelled out in the policy document.

LC Planning Commissioner Kaylor asked about the floodplain.

Ms. Pauly said the North Gateway site is entirely in the 100-year flood plain. The Mill Race had some parcels that are not in the floodplain.

Commissioner Stewart said during a brief presentation about setbacks in floodplains, discussion was held regarding setbacks. He asked about distances and how they would address it if the new rules go through.

Ms. Pauly said they are following this very closely and have thought of ways to buffer our waterways. She noted the width in some of the areas which provide ample buffer. The City has an agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers that already requires a 100 foot buffer on any city-owned property so there would be at least a 100-foot buffer on the Mill Race site. Staff looked at the other areas using 200-foot buffers as a guide and they would still have developable land.

Assistant City Attorney Kristina Kraaz said they don't yet know what the ultimate regulations will be. There was a reasonable alternative suggested by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), but FEMA doesn't have to go with that. There will be interim measures that will take effect within the next two years which includes a proposal that in a 175-foot buffer area, development would be limited. In the flood plain outside of the buffer, they are looking at some ratios for mitigation so development could be possible. The City can't stop all planning efforts while waiting to see what is implemented.

Commissioner Stewart said he has been working with some constituents in the County that were trying to get a loan on property in the floodplain. The application has changed regarding whether or not the development would have an impact on species, and no one was willing to sign off on that. He asked how that can be addressed.

Ms. Pauly said the City gives developers wanting to build in the floodplain, a letter with information on what is going on at the State and Federal level.

Ms. Kraaz said it sounds like the County was being conservative in that regard.

Mr. Miller said this situation comes up more in the County. FEMA told the County that they need to sign an agreement, which is a requirement. The 175-foot setback is from the ordinary high-water mark, not the edge of the floodplain. There would not be a prohibition on development in the entire area.

Ms. Kaylor asked if floodway was in the buffer zone.

Ms. Pauly said currently, the buffer is 75 feet per our existing regulations. If this property was in our UGB today, the City would require a 75-foot setback. This proposal designates land in the land use plan as a natural resource, so not developable. People could develop beyond that buffer. The buffer follows the floodway as mapped by FEMA.

Ms. Kraaz said the proposal is that development would be limited in the larger of 175-foot buffer, or the floodway. Where the floodway is larger than 175 feet, it would include the whole floodway.

Commissioner Leiken asked if the new zoning of Agricultural Urban Holding had been adopted in the City of Redmond. Ms. Pauly responded that it had. Commissioner Leiken said that means the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff has experience working with this.

Ms. Pauly said the DLCD has posted the City of Redmond's UGB expansion as a model on their website.

Commissioner Leiken said having a precedence set is good news.

Councilor Moore said she appreciates the work being done. She asked Ms. Pauly to explain how the legislature had a part in making this such a lengthy process.

Ms. Pauly said the 2014 legislature passed a law that required the State to update the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) that governs how UGB amendments are studied and processed. The City of Springfield, City of Eugene and about 7 or 8 other cities were using the old rules. These cities were told the rules had changed completely. Because of the years of work using the old rules, the cities asked the legislature to pass a bill to allow them to use the rules that were in effect when they started the process in 2009. The effort was successful and in March 2016, the City learned they would be able to move forward with the existing rules.

Commissioner Bozievich said the recommendation to revise the mapping of floodways with the 90% rather than the 50% is also in the Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives (RPA). He is surprised Maple Island Slough is not considered part of the floodway. There is more to come from FEMA. The majority of the area in South 28th is in the floodplain, and in those cases there is discussion about having to mitigate any historic volume lost, including displaced water. If they move forward with this RPA, it will affect the ability to develop. He asked about the College View property. There is a considerable amount of exception land parallel to I-5, and the land sits on low value soils. The fact that land is no longer being considered may come up when going forward so they need to make sure their findings are strong.

Mayor Lundberg said much of what we do now is controlled by litigation. They have weighed out what we most need, what we most want, and what would work the best. The amount of acreage has already been reduced significantly in order to present the best case. Gateway has always been a prime area to expand. She agrees with the flood plain issues. When in Washington DC earlier this year, she visited with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) who said their goal was to restrict development. With that in mind, they all have to be aware.

Ms. Kraaz said interim measures must be taken, but we don't know what those are at this time. The new mapping requirements and other implementations could take years.

Mayor Lundberg said it affects all of our riverfront properties, so the City needs to remain on top of this situation. Congressman DeFazio has also taken a personal interest in this and is working on it as much as he can. They can't wait or they would never get this done.

Mr. Bozievich said the biological opinion doesn't take into account Oregon land use laws. Because our UGB's may have an impact on floodplain close to cities, we are providing huge amounts of preservation and resource land east of Springfield and north on the Willamette River.

Commissioner Sorenson asked about the public comment opportunities.

Ms. Pauly noted the open houses and public hearing dates that are scheduled. The public hearing will be held at Springfield City Hall.

Commissioner Sorenson said the Commissioners had a briefing on the NOAA fisheries work. He asked if there might be interest from the Planning Commission members of Eugene, Lane County and Springfield, and the elected officials to hear that briefing and invite NOAA officials to attend. Perhaps they can also learn from other communities that have had NOAA or Oregon Fish and Wildlife buyoff on their land use. That information may be helpful as they move forward. This has happened in other parts of the country such as Arizona where the desert tortoise lives.

LC Planning Commissioner Hledik said he is looking forward to the staff report for Planning Commission work session. He asked where the employment projections came from, how the number of large parcels was determined, and how the acreage was derived.

Ms. Pauly said Attachment 1 of tonight's agenda packet is a briefing memo with a high level summary of how those things were done. Attachment 2 was the graphic summary document. Attachment 5 is the very long staff report that the elected officials would be adopting.

LC Planning Commissioner Sisson asked if the GIS staff used to develop the maps is based on the same GIS flood insurance maps that have not yet been released. If so, he asked if this data can be used if the other maps have not been released.

Ms. Pauly said staff is using the currently adopted FEMA data. They have looked at the proposed maps to get a sense of the changes. Until those maps are official, the City can't use them.

Mr. Miller said studies regarding Seavey Loop have been ongoing for several years.

LC Planning Commissioner Sisson asked if staff was monitoring that so they overlay what is being proposed. Ms. Pauly responded that they were monitoring those studies.

Councilor Ralston said the City did detailed studies of each area, including Seavey Loop.

Mayor Lundberg thanked everyone for coming out for this meeting. The next JEO is scheduled for September 12, 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:37 p.m. by Lane County Planning Commission, Lane County Board of Directors and Springfield City Council.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Christine L. Lundberg
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY JULY 18, 2016

The City of Springfield Council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday July 18, 2016 at 5:30 p.m., with Mayor Lundberg presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Lundberg and Councilors VanGordon, Wylie, Moore, Ralston, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were Acting City Manager Anette Spickard, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

1. Springfield Economic Look – Regional Competitiveness and Industry Assessment and Economic Strategy.

Courtney Griesel, Community Development Manager, presented the staff report on this item.

In September, the City will begin a project to create a city-wide economic development strategy with a focus on regional and national competitiveness and industry opportunities. This work will provide the foundation to later develop and market the community and industry values and opportunities through the creation of a Springfield Economic Development Marketing and Branding plan. The economic development strategy work is fully budgeted and anticipated to be complete in April, 2017. Marketing and branding would occur at a later date following completion of the economic strategy. The City is proposing to sole source this work to Allison Larsen with TadZo Consulting. TadZo is a leader in strategic economic development planning and marketing and branding work. Allison worked recently and extensively in the region to guide the regional “Big Look” efforts. In 2014, Allison worked specifically with the Springfield City Council and staff to explore tough questions and dialogue around our urban growth boundary expansion.

City Council has identified economic development and the Springfield economic look as priority initiatives, acknowledging a need to understand our competitive advantages and disadvantages in the regional and national markets. Funds were budgeted for this work during the FY17 budget process in an amount of \$75,000. The goal for this project will be to generate a strategy and marketing plan which sets clear direction for realistic priorities while clarifying responsibilities and metrics for implementation; the plan will identify where the City is best positioned to ‘go’ and how to most effectively get ‘there.’

Provided as Attachment 1 of the agenda packet is a detailed discussion of the proposed work, outlining;

- Why an Economic Strategic Plan and Marketing Effort, and
- Phased Work and Costs to Complete the Project;
 - Phase I – Strategic Economic Plan
Cost: \$64,500 (budgeted)
Estimated Start Time: September 2016
Estimated Complete: April 2017
 - Phase II – Economic Development Marketing and Branding
Cost: \$35,499 (not budgeted)
Estimated Time to Complete: Four Months

Ms. Griesel described Phase I.

Step 1 – Where are we now?

- A. Economic Performance
- B. Competitiveness Assessment
- C. Economic Development Program Review

Step 2 – Where do we want to be?

- A. Stakeholder Input
- B. Target Industry Analysis;
 - a. Industry trends research and screening
 - b. Capabilities screening
 - c. Niche and Emerging Industry Sectors
 - d. Industry Intelligence
- C. Competitor Benchmarking
- D. Priorities Interactive Work Session

Step 3 – How will we get there?

- A. Priority Strategic Initiative Work Sessions
- B. Written Plan
- C. Final Plan Presentation!

Ms. Griesel said looking at these things will help staff identify the priorities and work needed to move forward. This allows the City to look at the data to understand how we are positioned to be most competitive in for economic growth. It also helps staff and leadership assess new projects and opportunities and how they align with industry trends or the priorities set by the City. Staff has asked Ms. Larsen to create the plan and provide a train the trainer method by teaching staff how to do these things and update the plan in the future. Staff would love to start discussions about funding the marketing and branding component. Tonight, they are looking for feedback from the Council.

Councilor Woodrow said this is something whose time has come. In pulling the data together, she asked how many years of accumulation the trending encompassed.

Ms. Griesel said it was dependent on the industry. She could get clarification from Ms. Larsen.

Councilor Woodrow asked if there is a general standard for prospective developers.

Ms. Griesel said again it depends on the industry and is case specific. In the second phase of work, they will go into details of the general targets identified.

Councilor Woodrow said that is more beneficial than a standard response. In looking at the categories of entities researched, she did not see women's professional business networks, and other business networks, including the Board of Realtors.

Ms. Griesel said they will better define the stakeholders once they start. She acknowledged there may be some groups that are missing and will be added.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if the proposal was asking us to hire TADZo.

Ms. Griesel said she would come back with a formal request to hire TADzo. Staff had started with discussions because Ms. Larsen has experience in the area of branding and marketing.

Ms. Smith said under the City's public contracting code there is an exemption for marketing consultants and would not be subject to the same Request for Proposals (RFP) process. \$100,000 is the sole source maximum.

Councilor Pishioneri said a competitor may look at this as being excluded.

Ms. Griesel said the \$99,999 is an internal dollar amount, not a State requirement. Staff will bring the contract forward if needed.

Councilor Pishioneri said he wants to make sure it is clear they are doing their due diligence. He likes what he sees so far, but hopes the product will be more clear than this information.

Councilor Moore asked if they would have a better idea of the timeline once Ms. Larsen is hired.

Ms. Griesel said the earliest Ms. Larsen is available to start is September. If the City wanted to change the start date, other adjustments might be needed to extend the timeline.

Councilor Ralston asked how much the City pays the Springfield Chamber.

Ms. Griesel said \$45,000. It was recently increased from \$35,000.

Councilor Ralston said this seems like a steep price tag. He is not concerned about our brand, but wants someone who is looking for industries who might want to move here. He wants to make sure we aren't duplicating services we receive from the Springfield Chamber and Travel Lane County (TLC).

Ms. Griesel said Chamber funds are specifically for tourism services. The City works with the Chamber regarding economic development, but this work will be helpful for both entities to be able to respond to questions from industry and the public. TLC focuses on tourism, hotels and heads on beds. The City is looking at jobs in other industry areas. TLC is funded through a share of our overnight stay revenues.

Councilor Ralston asked about the time period involved.

Ms. Griesel said 6-8 months starting in September, wrapping up in April. Work sessions and meetings with stakeholders will occur during that time frame.

Councilor Ralston said he is excited to see what they come up with. Springfield needs to go out and target industry to come into town. It is going to be a tough environment with the State tax system.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if the \$75,000 was approved.

Ms. Griesel said they have not yet authorized Phase 2 and do not have the budget for that additional expense. Phase 1 will cost about \$65,000. Staff will likely come back in the next budget cycle or if funds become available to request completion of Phase 2. The Budget Committee and Council would review that request.

Councilor VanGordon said overall it looks good. He asked how Ms. Larsen would be dealing with regional issues.

Ms. Griesel said from a geographic perspective, it is focused on Springfield. When they get into the labor market and incomes, it will be a regional look. Ms. Larsen will identify how competitive Springfield is with comparable cities with comparable industries in surrounding states. That helps us understand our positioning at a national scale.

Councilor VanGordon said the main thing will be the end product. He wants to see some actionable items come from the final work plan.

Mayor Lundberg said she had worked with Allison and she was very good. She has a national perspective. They need a sense of who we want to reach out to proactively. It will be important to do the marketing piece in addition. Ms. Larsen has a distinct way of doing things, gets you where you need to go, and is familiar with the Council and the region. In addition to employment, we need to think about our transportation system, projections for population, and how to have more businesses. This gives us an opportunity to better define what the City wants to do. She is happy with what Ms. Larsen has put together to date.

Councilor Pishioneri asked what the City will get for Phase 1.

Ms. Griesel said Phase 2 requires Phase 1, but Phase 1 does not require Phase 2. Staff would like to see Phase 2 approved as it provides more technology moving forward. Phase 1 will provide the train-the-trainer work, allowing staff to update the plan as needed in the future. Phase 2 is the package to wrap up the information from Phase 1 with an out-facing brand and additional resources and tools.

Mayor Lundberg said Council is supportive of moving forward.

2. Downtown District Design Standards (File No. TYP414-00001).

Linda Pauly, Principal Planner, presented the staff report on this item.

Mayor Lundberg said last time they met the Council discussed streets, and now they will discuss building standards. She asked Ms. Pauly to go over which things need discussed. It was helpful to have a long list of question staff needs answered by the Council.

Councilor Ralston said it all looks great on paper, but the cost of doing this is high. He is not sure how they would get existing businesses to do this. He doesn't want Downtown streets to look like the diagrams; he wants it to look like Springfield. Bringing them up to these standards is onerous.

Mayor Lundberg said she didn't like neon signs in the Plaza District. She asked for clarification on new design standards and how they are meant to fit with existing buildings.

Ms. Pauly said the proposed standards are trying to use those historic patterns. A lot of it is based on work from the Historic Commission. The concept of the new area between the existing Main Street and the river and Glenwood takes into account that development may have a larger scale to it in that area. That area has larger lots and different patterns could emerge there. Council had noted that they would like to see that area as a smooth transition between the existing historic Main Street and new development in Glenwood.

Mayor Lundberg asked what size shops are allowed in the Glenwood District. She is not too concerned about transition between Downtown from Glenwood, but would prefer to see an identifying characteristic between Downtown and Glenwood such as the bridge. She asked if they were looking at

larger retail Downtown because Glenwood would not have larger retail, or if there was some duplication.

Ms. Pauly said there would be some duplication. The previous vision adopted by Council in 2010 was a desire to have more retail space. We currently don't have enough square footage to have a viable retail district in Downtown. Retail, including restaurants and stores, is part of a successful downtown.

Councilor Moore asked about the cost of meeting these standards for those businesses that wanted to remodel.

Ms. Pauly said only major exterior improvements trigger the new development standards. There are different levels depending on what is being done.

Councilor Moore asked about programs that could assist with the cost.

Mayor Lundberg said that would be a different conversation.

Councilor Ralston said tonight's topic is Downtown, and Glenwood is a different conversation. He doesn't see Main Street changing that much. He would be more supportive of this in Glenwood. He doesn't support trees and dividers as they take up too much roadway and are a huge expense.

Councilor Woodrow said one of the busiest areas on Main Street is Plank Town with the tables and chairs outside. They created an attractive place. It's possible to do that in other areas of Main Street without major remodeling of the buildings, but it takes incentives. She has seen businesses come in and improve their site, bringing it up to the new standards. That is not a bad thing. After several take that step, more people will become interested. She wants to see Downtown as walkable from 10th Street to Pioneer Parkway with stores that attract people to encourage them to keep walking. We need to have something like this to create that atmosphere.

Councilor VanGordon said this is still way too complicated and he is ready for the next draft. It needs to be streamlined. He wants to see Downtown with the historic look to the buildings. We need a plaza Downtown, but he doesn't want to lock the City into something specific.

Councilor Wylie agreed that it is too complicated. She doesn't want to lose our uniqueness, but doesn't want something unattractive coming in. They need to be careful not to require too much of the businesses, and be sensitive to what is existing and not requiring too much standardization. Too many standards will take the unique character of Downtown Springfield away.

Ms. Pauly said in the existing code, there is a list of different amenities that can be provided when a developer comes in. They don't have to do everything on the list. She asked if that was a good way to go about the proposed standards. There may be some things they definitely want, but other things could be requests.

Councilor Pishioneri said this is complicated. He asked about the 18 inch step up into the building. Many buildings are in need of upgrading and modernizing, but he doesn't want to lose what we already have. The standards look like a full modernization of Downtown. These standards could put off developers.

Councilor Ralston said this looks like a cookie cutter, but he wants to keep Downtown as it is. He wants to see something that can be used for Downtown.

Councilor Woodrow said her vision is a light updated look, but not modernization. She doesn't want to lose the character and personality in Downtown. She agreed the standards need to be simplified.

Councilor Moore said there appears to be some flexibility in the standards.

Ms. Pauly said the City did ask the consultant for more flexibility than the current standards. Many of the photos that the Council did not like were examples of what current code allows. The next time they bring this to Council, they will show examples of current versus proposed standards.

Mayor Lundberg said they are in agreement that the standards need to be refined, clarified and simplified. Council wants to keep the Downtown historic buildings, although there are some older buildings that aren't historic and could be replaced. It would be nice to have new buildings that are complimentary to the historic buildings. Main Street to A Street is her focus in this area and there is an opportunity for moving more activity to A Street. The area around City Hall, referred to as the Town Square, is friendly and inviting. They need to figure out how to make our design standards so someone could design something complimentary. They don't want to lose the sense of the historic area, but need to allow some flexibility.

Ms. Pauly asked if the Royal Building fit their definition of a complimentary new building in Downtown.

The majority of the Council said it did.

Councilor Pishioneri said for him that building pushes the envelope of modernization.

Ms. Pauly said staff had done outreach with community meetings and citizen advisory committee meetings. The idea of the setbacks has been favorable.

Mayor Lundberg asked who was reviewing this proposal.

Ms. Pauly said an architect who works for several developers serves on the citizen advisory committee. They plan on doing more outreach to the development community.

Mayor Lundberg said it is important to check in with the developers about these standards since they would be most likely to invest in Downtown.

Ms. Pauly said they did have a real estate appraiser on the committee.

Councilor Wylie said she would like staff to find out from developers what is feasible and what is not.

Councilor Ralston spoke about incentives and said he is not supportive of the city providing funds.

Ms. Pauly said some of the public improvements the Council has approved such as downtown lighting provide incentives.

Mayor Lundberg said businesses want to come.

Councilor Woodrow said other stores encourage others.

Mayor Lundberg said the block where Plank Town is located looks the best. The buildings have colors that complement each other and look warm and friendly. It is reflective of early Downtown Springfield.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Christine L. Lundberg
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY JULY 18, 2016

The City of Springfield Council met in regular session in the Council Chambers, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday July 18, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., with Mayor Lundberg presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Lundberg and Councilors VanGordon, Wylie, Moore, Ralston, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were Development and Public Works Director Anette Spickard (AIS City Manager), Community Relations Manager Niel Laudati, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Lundberg.

SPRINGFIELD UPBEAT

1. Mayor's Recognition

- a. World Breastfeeding Week Proclamation.

Mayor Lundberg read the proclamation and encouraged all citizens of Springfield to help support and promote breastfeeding in our community. Gabby from Daisy C.H.A.I.N. was present to accept the proclamation.

2. Other

- a. Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Certificate of Achievement Presentation.

Anette Spickard, Acting City Manager, presented the award to Accounting Manager Nate Bell and Accountant Meg Allocco. The City has received this award for 35 years. The Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting is awarded by the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) for the City's comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR). This award represents a lot of hard work on behalf of our Finance staff. This distinction contributes to our overall credit rating.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Claims

- a. Approval of the June 2016, Disbursements for approval.

2. Minutes

- a. June 6, 2016 – Work Session
- b. June 6, 2016 – Regular Meeting
- c. June 13, 2016 – Special Regular Meeting
- d. June 20, 2016 – Regular Meeting

3. Resolutions

- a. RESOLUTION NO. 2016-21 – A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO AWARD COMPETITIVE BIDS, REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS, OTHER PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS EXEMPT FROM BIDDING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE PURCHASING REGULATIONS, AND APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC CONTRACTS IN CONFORMANCE WITH CITY OF SPRINGFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE AND ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS DURING THE PERIOD COMMENCING JULY 26, 2016 AND CONTINUING THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2016 WHILE THE COMMON COUNCIL IS IN RECESS.

4. Ordinances

- a. ORDINANCE NO. 6354 – AN ORDINANCE REPEALING SPRINGFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE SECTIONS 2.900 THROUGH 2.995.

5. Other Routine Matters

- a. Approval of the Brand Name Specification Exemption Request for Street Light Poles, LED Retrofit Kits and Powder Coating Authorizing Brand Name Merchandise to be Specified in Future Street Lighting Projects.
- b. Award the Subject Contract to Essex General Construction, Inc. in the Amount of \$284,794.00 for Project P11004, Springfield Wellness Center.
- c. Allow Construction Activities Outside of the Hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., in Order to Complete Construction Activities in Association with the McKenzie Willamette Medical Center Expansion in and Around 1460 G Street.
- d. Allow Construction Activities Outside of the Hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., in order to Complete Construction Activities in Association with the Cash & Carry Development in and around 3585 Gateway Street (Formerly 1073 International Way).
- e. Authorize the Development and Public Works Director to Issue a Public Right-of-Way Use Agreement to JM Hotel, LLC to Construct, Operate, and Maintain one Monument Sign and Associated Landscaping.
- f. Authorize and Direct the City Manager to Execute the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Willamalane Park and Recreation District (WPRD) for Construction and Maintenance of the Mill Race Path.
- g. Approve the Purchase of Police Vehicles for Fiscal Year 2017 and Authorize the City Manager to Sign Three Contracts for the Purchase of Five Patrol Vehicles and One Administrative Sergeant's Vehicle.
- h. Authorize and Direct the City Manager to Execute Amendment 1 to the Utility Services Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with Springfield Utility Board (SUB) for the Glenwood Refinement Plan Area.
- i. Approve and Authorize the City Manager to Sign a Contract for Animal Shelter Services with Greenhill Humane Society, as Well as the Sole Source Justification.
- j. Authorize City Manager Contract 1443 with Republic Parking Northwest, Extending the Term of the Agreement through June 30, 2018.
- k. Authorize the City Manager to Sign the Second Amendment to the Contract with McKenzie Defense Consortium, LLC for Court Appointed Attorney Services for the Period from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 with the Possibility for Another One-year Renewal.
- l. Approve the Amended Council Operating Policies and Procedures.

- m. Approval of the Liquor License Application for JGB Enterprises LLC., DBA: The Man Cave, Located at 1444 Main Street, Springfield, Oregon.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR WITH ITEM 5 M REMOVED. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

ITEMS REMOVED

5. m. Approval of the Liquor License Application for JGB Enterprises LLC., DBA: The Man Cave, Located at 1444 Main Street, Springfield, Oregon,

Councilor Moore said she had asked to have this item removed. She asked the City Attorney for an explanation of the process and the Council's responsibilities with this request.

City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith said the City's role is to endorse the OLCC license; they are not the approving body. OLCC licensing does allow nude dancing as part of this type of premise and proposed license. There are some 1st Amendment and Freedom of Expression laws around that type of dancing so the City or State cannot deny the license based on just that criteria. When a business comes in for an OLCC license, that building goes through the other departments in the City to ensure the building is up to Fire Code, Building Code and it is a fully permitted structure. That has occurred to date. Council's endorsement of the application does not say they approve of the use.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO APPROVE ITEM 5.M. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

PUBLIC HEARINGS - Please limit comments to 3 minutes. Request to speak cards are available at both entrances. Please present cards to City Recorder. Speakers may not yield their time to others.

1. Public Hearing on 2016 Justice Assistant Grant

Michael Harman, Police Associate Program Manager, presented the staff report on this item.

As part of the application process for the annual Justice Assistance Grant, the City and the Department is required to hold a public hearing to allow public comment. The Department is proposing to use the 2016 Justice Assistance Grant to purchase instant recall/replay functionality for Dispatch radio consoles, and to pay for additional training for a detective assigned to the Computer Forensics program.

The City of Springfield is eligible to receive \$18,251 from the Department of Justice 2016 Local Justice Assistance Grant (JAG). This is an annual, non-competitive grant intended to support public safety goals. The Department expects to receive these funds sometime in the Fall, and the grant period will be for two years. Previous awards have been used to support specialized equipment purchases, training for police and court staff, and support for community policing programs.

The Department is proposing that this year's grant award be used to purchase "instant recall/instant replay" functionality for the three main radio console positions in the Dispatch center, at a cost of \$11,430. The remaining funds, \$6,821, would be used to pay for additional training and equipment for

the detective assigned to the computer forensics program. Specifically, the grant will allow this detective to attend training specific to Apple computers and iPhone computer systems.

The Department has requested this public hearing to inform the Council and the public of the grant opportunity, and to meet a grant requirement that a public hearing be held for comment on the proposed uses of the grant award.

Councilor Woodrow said she was in favor of both uses of the grant funding. She felt the instant replay unit will be very helpful. The more we have in computer forensics, the better for our community.

Councilor Pishioneri said he also supports the uses. He asked if they would also be looking at permanent funding for equipment besides the grant funding. He would like to look into the officers on the street having throw-on 4.

Mayor Lundberg asked for an explanation of what they were referring.

Mr. Harman said these are ballistic vests and are rated for the caliber round they can stop. The most protective kind has the solid plates that go into them. They are heavier and more expensive.

Councilor Pishioneri said level 4 hard plates would stop high velocity rifle rounds. He would like to have staff look into the 4 for our officers. Information could be brought back in a Communication Packet.

Mayor Lundberg opened the public hearing.

No one appeared to speak.

Mayor Lundberg closed the public hearing.

BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

1. John Logan, Springfield, OR. Mr. Logan noted that the section of T Street between 1200 and 1400 was a dead end road for years. Twelve years ago it was opened up for through traffic and with the heavier traffic load is now degrading with cracks and weeds growing in the cracks. They are asking for a slurry seal for that section of the road. He noted other streets in the area that have gotten the slurry seal. Without the slurry seal, it will be costly to repair. He distributed copies showing that section of the road to Ms. Spickard. He noted he is in favor of the 3 cent gas tax.

Ms. Spickard said we don't currently have funding for this street, but it is on the backlog list.

Mayor Lundberg said the backlog would be addressed through a 3 cent fuel tax.

Councilor Wylie said the Council also wants to get these streets fixed and has been looking for ways to get funding.

2. Frank Lawson, Eugene, OR. Mr. Lawson introduced himself as the new General Manager for Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB). He grew up in the area and left for about twenty-five years before returning to his hometown. He thanked the City of Springfield for their

cooperation over the years. He is looking forward to working together on a number of projects in the future.

The Mayor and Council welcomed Mr. Lawson.

3. Sandra Gulley, Springfield, OR. Ms. Gulley said she is frustrated. She called the City and was told that the law that people had to keep their yards up and weeds down was dropped. She contacted the person across the street from her, said he said he would clean up the yard, but he has not. The weeds are very high and now they are dry and could be a fire hazard. It is unfair to the neighbors who keep their properties up. She has to put up a new fence due to damage from the blackberries. The neighbors on each side have to do the same thing. The woman who owns the property with the blackberries has never been made to clean up her property. The house has now been condemned. She pays her taxes, but the City is not there to back them up. She distributed some pictures of the property. She would like to see that law put back into place. It is affecting all of Springfield.

Mayor Lundberg said she would have staff talk with Ms. Gulley.

Ms. Spickard said staff is aware of the property and it has been posted “do not occupy”. She will have Building and Land Development Manager Matt Ruettgers call Ms. Gulley tomorrow about what the City can do.

Mayor Lundberg asked if this was up for a nuisance violation.

Ms. Spickard said Code Enforcement had looked at the property and there isn’t anything that falls into the criteria of a code violation. Mr. Ruettgers said he would be happy to contact the owner of the property to try to encourage them to take care of it.

4. Geraldine Harrington, Springfield, OR. Ms. Harrington said she is here with Ms. Gulley and lives next door to the subject property. She bought her place in 1971. The neighboring house was kept up until the owner passed away. The place is now in very bad shape. She has called code enforcement numerous times. The Fire Marshal agreed it was a fire hazard, but nothing has been done. She needs to put up a new fence because the blackberries had ruined her fence. She cleans out the blackberries on her side, but is not able to go onto the neighboring property. Her property values have gone down and no one would buy her home. The house should have been condemned in 1989. They used to have dozens of cats and even after the owner left she would drop cats off there. Ms. Harrington has continued to call the City and doesn’t know what else to do. People drop cigarette butts along that area, which is another fire hazard. She distributed photos of the property.

Mayor Lundberg said someone would contact Ms. Harrington as well.

Councilor Moore asked if there was anything the City could do about the blackberry briars.

Ms. Spickard said her understanding is that the City can only remove them if it is in the right-of-way. We do not have the legal authority to go on private property.

Ms. Smith said there may be something in the fire code about a distance from the fence.

Mayor Lundberg said when they had nuisance issues, the City came up with the nuisance ordinance. She asked staff to look at what we changed in our Code and what we could do to address these issues.

Ms. Smith said there are nuisance laws between private properties.

5. Steve Moe, Springfield, OR. Mr. Moe spoke regarding the gas tax. He said he is fully supportive and feels it could pass.
During the work session, the Council discussed downtown and economic development which are two different items, yet are tied together. He is strong behind economic development. There are a lot of Springfield's around the country trying to do the same thing. We need to find something unique.

COUNCIL RESPONSE

CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

1. Petition from Main Street Businesses Regarding Main Street Transit Study.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO ACCEPT THE CORRESPONDENCE FOR FILING. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

BIDS

ORDINANCES

1. Amend Springfield Municipal Code 2.340.

ORDINANCE NO. 2 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2, “GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION” SECTION 2.340 “RECORDS RETENTION SCHEDULE” OF THE SPRINGFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE (SMC) TO MATCH UPDATED OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND UPDATING THE DEFINITION OF CITY RECORDS (FIRST READING)

Amy Sowa, City Recorder, presented the staff report on this item.

Following an update to the Oregon Administrative Rules governing the City Retention Schedule, the Springfield Municipal Code needs to be amended with the new Administrative Rule reference.

Following a year-long review of Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 166, Division 200, which governs the retention of records produced and maintained by cities in the State of Oregon, the revised OAR was formally adopted in the summer of 2014.

Under Springfield Municipal Code Section 2.340 Records Retention Schedule, reference is made to the OAR for the City Retention Schedule. This amendment updates this to the current OAR reference, and also expands on the definition of a city record to include all formats.

Councilor Ralston asked if it was illegal for the Council to delete their email.

Ms. Sowa said the Council email are public record and must follow retention based on the content. She noted some of the retention periods for specific records. If the Council has questions about their emails, they can contact her for assistance.

No action requested. First reading only.

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL

1. Mayor Lundberg said the Joint Transportation Committee is coming to the area on Wednesday, July 20 to hear what local officials feel is important in the way of transportation issues. There will be lunch, a tour, and public hearing. The Committee is trying to be more transparent this time around.
2. Councilor Pishioneri spoke regarding the Metropolitan Wastewater Management Commission (MWMC). The commission voted on and ratified the FY16/17 budget and looked at their insurance. They also went through their mission, vision and values to determine how to get the word out about MWMC. The commission is looking for DEQ licensing. A new commissioner from Eugene was appointed to replace a member who had resigned. MWMC got 156 acres of the biocycle farm poplar tree replanted.

Mayor Lundberg said she keeps trying to sell the poplars because they can be used to make veneer.

3. Councilor Moore said the City won an award for the Cross Laminated Timber (CLT) grant in the amount of \$155,000. That will help establish the parking garage in Glenwood.

Mayor Lundberg said it will be a big catalyst for Glenwood and provide an opportunity for the University of Oregon (UO) and Oregon State University (OS) to study effects of CLT. We have the corner of the market on innovation and Advanced Timber at the moment. She notified Dr. World Nieh of the US Forestry Department in DC about the award and he was very happy for Springfield. He has been a proponent of Springfield and will be a help in the future to make sure we can use our Advanced Wood Products effectively.

4. Councilor Wylie thanked Bob Duey and staff for their work on the GFOA award. These awards mean the City is maintaining wonderful standards and staff is doing a good job. We can feel secure our department is doing well.

Mayor Lundberg agreed.

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY MANAGER

1. Resolution for a Ballot Title to Increase the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax by \$.03 Per Gallon.

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-22 – A RESOLUTION REFERRING TO THE ELECTORS OF THE CITY A BALLOT MEASURE AUTHORIZING THE INCREASE IN THE SPRINGFIELD MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX BY 3 CENTS PER GALLON.

Anette Spickard, Development and Public Works Director, and Mary Bridget Smith, City Attorney, presented the staff report on this item.

To begin to address high priority unfunded projects in the Street Preservation and Repair project list, the City Council is proposing an increase in the local fuel tax in Springfield by \$.03 per gallon, from \$.03 to \$.06 per gallon.

Since 2008, staff have briefed the Council regularly on the decline in pavement condition quality of the City's roadway system resulting from the elimination of the City's street preservation program due to stagnation of local and state fuel taxes, and the loss of County payments supported by revenues under the Secure Rural Schools Act of 2000. In 2008, 19% of the City's streets were in poor condition. As of the 2015 Street Condition Survey, 51% of the City's streets were in poor condition.

On January 25, 2016 Council reviewed the list of unfunded high priority street preservation and repair projects and directed staff to conduct a scientific voter survey regarding voter opinion on a fuel tax increase or a property tax increase to fund street preservation and repair. On June 20, 2016 the Council received the results of the survey showing support for a fuel tax increase and very little support for a property tax increase. Council gave direction to staff to present a resolution and ballot title for a three cent fuel tax increase at the July 18, 2016 Regular Meeting for their adoption to refer this item to the November 8, 2016 General Election ballot.

Ms. Spickard said the 3 cent fuel tax is estimated to bring in an estimated \$1.1M annually. The backlog of projects is estimated at about \$30M so this would just help get started. The money will be dedicated to road preservation and repair activities including slurry seal, overlay and other preservation to maintain collector streets. The ballot title states no new City staff would be added, all funds would go to preservation projects. Staff would provide a report each year of projects completed.

Councilor Ralston clarified that this would raise our current 3 cent tax to 6 cents. He asked if the additional 3 cents would raise the \$1.1M or the full 6 cents.

Ms. Spickard said it is the 3 cent increment.

Councilor Ralston said that is not clear in the ballot title.

Ms. Spickard said that can be included.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2016-22. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY

1. Proposed Changes to Springfield Municipal Code 7.330 and 7.332.

ORDINANCE NO. 6355 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE SPRINGFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE SECTIONS 7.330 AND 7.332 REGARDING PUBLIC PASSENGER VEHICLE SERVICES.

Kristina Kraaz and Mary Bridget Smith, City Attorneys, presented the staff report on this item.

The City of Eugene administers and enforces the business license requirements for public passenger vehicles for both Eugene and Springfield. Eugene recently updated their code and administrative regulations to allow for transportation network companies (TNCs) to operate in the area. For those

operators to be able to conduct business in Springfield with the license issued by Eugene, the City Council needs to co-adopt the code amendments. There is no cost to Springfield for Eugene to provide this service, nor does Springfield receive any license revenue. Adopting the proposed code amendment will have no financial impact to the City. From the operator perspective, it is more cost effective to obtain one license and follow one set of standards in order to operate in both cities.

A first reading was conducted on May 2. In response to Council's requests for further information and clarification of the inspection requirements for traditional taxis and TNC vehicles under Eugene's adopted administrative rules, a Council Briefing Memo is attached.

Mayor Lundberg asked if they changed anything in Eugene after Springfield commented.

Ms. Kraaz said Eugene had said they wanted to see how the new regulations worked first and then would consider Springfield's comments.

Mayor Lundberg said Uber had made it clear that they would not come to area with the current code as written in Eugene, especially concerning insurance. She is concerned that Eugene passed their Administrative Rules and it is done. The City has to adopt the code amendments in order to allow taxis to work in Springfield. We will be stuck with that until they decide they want to do something different, or Springfield meets with Eugene again. If Springfield adopted something different, there would be two sets of licensing. She is frustrated because the changes Springfield suggested were based off Portland's code and Eugene did not change anything from what was first seen by the Council.

Ms. Kraaz said their first published in November for public comment. At that time, they got feedback from Uber and Lyft and the public, and then made changes and brought forward in the Spring. No further changes were made based on Springfield feedback.

Mayor Lundberg said she had met with Uber representatives who said the new rules in Eugene would not allow them to come. She asked Council how they would like to proceed. She asked Ms. Kraaz if the insurance got changed.

Ms. Kraaz said the insurance requirements did not get changed. The City of Eugene's comments on that were that there were several lawsuits were filed against Uber and Lyft. Eugene felt that without tougher insurance standards, the City could face liability.

Mayor Lundberg asked about background checks.

Councilor Pishioneri said they wanted to see what criteria were used for the background checks.

Ms. Kraaz said the City of Eugene used the background system that was used for taxis. The step above that was fingerprinting. Uber and Lyft said they would not go to jurisdictions that required fingerprinting requirements. No changes were made regarding signage either. If the code amendments are not approved tonight, Eugene could choose not to administer the program in Springfield. Any transportation companies that would like to locate in Eugene or Springfield would have to follow Springfield code when operating in Springfield. The current code allows only taxis. Eugene had received inquiries from other start-up transportation network companies about starting up an Oregon owned version of Uber or Lyft. She had not received additional information on those companies.

Councilor VanGordon asked what the City of Eugene's process was for Administrative Rules.

Ms. Kraaz said the City Manager adopts them without Council direction.

Councilor VanGordon said he would suggest adopting the code amendments to keep business occurring in Springfield, and then bring this topic back for discussion in the Fall. Council could ask staff to draft a letter from the Council about their frustration.

Mayor Lundberg said the Council should adopt the ordinance in order keep taxis in Springfield. Rather than a letter, she would prefer to have Mr. Grimaldi speak to Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz to see what would be the best steps to revisit this issue. Mayor Lundberg has spoken with Mayor Piercy of Eugene.

Councilor Pishioneri asked where the source of information was that the City of Eugene received that indicated the City could be in a position to be sued regarding the insurance.

Ms. Kraaz said there have been instances of collisions with Uber and Lyft where there was injury. There was uncertainty and questionability under the typical insurance model of what phase the vehicle was in during the accident. That lead to confusion about what level of insurance was in place at the time of the accident. She said she would get further information.

Mayor Lundberg said the closest jurisdiction to check would be Portland to see how they have handled those situations.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 6355. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

2. Recreational Marijuana Local Option Tax.

ORDINANCE NO. 6356 – AN ORDINANCE ADDING SECTION 7.1002(3) TO CHAPTER 7 OF THE SPRINGFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE AND IMPOSING A 3% TAX ON MARIJUANA RETAILERS’ RECREATIONAL SALES IN SPRINGFIELD AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-23 – A RESOLUTION REFERRING TO THE ELECTORS OF THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD THE MEASURE OF ORDINANCE NO. 6356 IMPOSING A 3% TAX ON MARIJUANA RETAILERS’ RECREATIONAL SALES IN SPRINGFIELD

Bob Duey, Finance Director presented the staff report on this item.

ORS 475B.345 allows the City to adopt a 3% tax on marijuana items sold by retailers who are licensed by OLCC (under ORS475B.110). The City Council has previously directed staff to prepare the required Council actions for this to occur. The tax must be adopted by ordinance that is referred by the City Council to the electors of the City at the next general statewide election, which occurs on November 8, 2016. The ordinance as presented will enable the tax to be levied pending the successful vote on November 8th. The Resolution to be passed by Council refers the measure to the voters and includes the actual wording for the ballot title that will be subsequently published for citizen review prior to filing with the County Elections Officer.

Council is being asked to select only one of three versions for the ballot title resolution. The difference between each is the optional placement of restrictions on the future use of any proceeds received from

the tax. Version 1 includes in the 20-word Statement, “The City of Springfield intends to use the net revenue from this tax for public safety purposes”. This version is the most restrictive method of the use of the revenue and limits the use of the revenue from this tax. Version 2 includes in the Explanatory Statement, “Under state law, there are no restrictions on how the City may use the revenues generated by this tax. The City intends to use the revenue for public safety purposes”. This is not an action in the ballot title, but more of an explanation for uses and is more of a policy direction. The policy could be changed if needed in the future. Version 3 has no Statement about uses and includes in the Explanatory Statement, “There are no restrictions on how the City may use the revenues generated by this tax”. Mr. Duey said it is difficult to determine the amount of revenue that would be generated from this tax.

Councilor Ralston asked why it is an emergency ordinance.

Mr. Duey said the emergency is to have the ordinance in place in order to be able to move ahead, and have the resolution to refer the measure ready in time for the November ballot. He explained the three versions in more detail.

Councilor Ralston said knowing how much will come in will make a difference in which version he would select.

Mr. Duey said there is no reliable source to determine the amount of funds anticipated. He explained.

Councilor Moore said she feels inclined towards Version 3. Version 2 doesn't seem up front as it gives the Council the ability to change where the funds go. She likes the ability to use it for things other than public safety, such as public health. She hopes the citizens of Springfield trust the Council to use it in a way that would benefit the City.

Councilor VanGordon asked how broad the term public safety is.

Mr. Duey said if they used the state definition, it includes mental and public health services that deal with the use of drugs.

Councilor VanGordon said he would treat the term as a policy issue rather than in the Statement, which is Version 2. If they are going in front of the voters and asking for something, they should let them know what they intend to do with the funds.

Councilor Pishioneri said he agrees with Version 2. The first thing they have to do is get the voters to say yes. As a voter, he would like to know the funds would be going to things related to the source, such as Cahoots, police, etc.

Councilor Ralston said he prefers Version 1 over Version 2.

Councilor Woodrow asked if the City is restricted to the Statement “for public safety” or if they could clarify it with “public health and safety”.

Ms. Smith said they could do that, but have to stay inside the word limit.

Councilor Woodrow said if that can be added, she is inclined to go with Version 2 because it gives room to explain public health and safety.

Ms. Smith said they can reword Version 1 to read, "City of Springfield intends to use the net revenue from this tax for public health and safety purposes".

Councilor Woodrow said she would be fine with Version 1 with that language. She would be fine with either Version 1 or 2.

Mayor Lundberg said she doesn't want to confuse people that this will fund police before going out for the police levy next year. Including language in the Statement of the ballot title would restrict future Councils and how they can use the funds. Funds from alcohol and tobacco are not restrictive, so this would put marijuana in its own category. She is thinking of Version 3 so they don't mislead people that these funds could be more than they are, it doesn't tie future Councils, and it doesn't put marijuana in a separate category. As an example, Transient Room Tax (TRT) funds are for tourism, but were formerly used for cutting weeds. She doesn't want to put in a restriction and interpret it broadly which could be misunderstood by the public.

Ms. Smith said responded to earlier requests to add language in the Statement. The funds the City gets from the State collection of taxes will go to public safety and public health. The funds discussed this evening are only those from the 3%.

Mayor Lundberg said the revenue would not be based on number of purchases, but by the number of retail outlets per City.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 6356. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2016-23 WITH VERSION 3. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5 FOR AND 1 AGAINST (PISHIONERI).

ADJOURNMENT – 8:10pm

RECONVENE – 8:37pm

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Lundberg and Councilors VanGordon, Wylie, Moore, Ralston, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were Development and Public Works Director Anette Spickard (AIS City Manager), Community Relations Manager Niel Laudati, City Attorney Mary Bridget Smith, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

BUSINESS FROM THE CITY MANAGER

1. Resolution to Ratify an Amendment to the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan.

RESOLUTION NO. 2016-24 – A RESOLUTION RAFTIYING AN AMENDMENT TO THE GLENWOOD URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.

Courtney Griesel, Community Development Manager, presented the staff report on this item.

The SEDA Board has taken action to amend the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan to include acquisitions of three parcels located in the Glenwood Riverfront area. Council is asked to ratify the SEDA Board's resolution amending the Glenwood Urban Renewal Plan.

IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR WOODROW WITH A SECOND BY COUNCILOR WYLIE TO ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. 2016-24. THE MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6 FOR AND 0 AGAINST.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned 8:39 p.m.

Minutes Recorder Amy Sowa

Christine L. Lundberg
Mayor

Attest:

City Recorder